



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,823	01/19/2001	Animesh Mishra	42390P10482	9868
21906	7590	06/09/2006	EXAMINER	
TROP PRUNER & HU, PC 1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750 HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631			HOLLOWAY III, EDWIN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2612	

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/765,823

Applicant(s)

MISHRA ET AL.

Examiner

Edwin C. Holloway, III

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20, 31-51, 53-62 and 64-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20, 31-51, 53-62, and 64-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but before the filing of a Notice of Appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or the commencement of a civil action. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3-27-06 has been entered. The examiner has considered the new presentation of claims and applicant's arguments in view of the disclosure and the present state of the prior art. And it is the examiner's opinion that the claims are unpatentable for the reasons set forth in this Office action:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 & 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-20, 31-45, 47-51, 53-62 and 64-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Art Unit: 2612

Johnson (US 5557254) in combination with Rick (US 6552648) and Hertel (US 5532690) in combination with

Regarding claim 1, Johnson discloses an apparatus comprising: a functional unit (200); a location determination device (419); a local policy enforcement device (300 - w/ GPS movement alarm in cols. 17-18) coupled to the location determination device and the functional unit; and a communication interface coupled (417,213) coupled to the local policy enforcement device for sending location information to a central agency 103 and receiving enable/disable commands from the central agency. See figs. 1-4 and col. 3 line 64 - col. 6 line 56. A failure to meet a local location policy is not expressly disclosed, but at least suggested by GPS triggered alarms disclosed in col. 17 lines 9-18 and col. 18 lines 16-17. Further, a GPS range alarm is disclosed in col. 25 line 63 - col. 26 line 64. Receiving an enable signal from the central agency when the location information complies with a remote policy is not expressly disclosed, but is suggested by clearing all alarms step 1299 in response to receiving acknowledgment in step 1297 that position report of step 1295 was received by the central agency. See fig. 10J and cols. 21-23. Further, the vehicle receives remote commands to enable/disable the vehicle from the central agency that includes a database of

Art Unit: 2612

position/location information, user authentication data and other conditions/policies used in determining if operation of the vehicle should be enabled or disabled in cols. 11 line 17 - col. 14 line 40. Enabling and disabling are provided because the ignition module and fuel line control valve may be turned both on and off in col. 5 line 55 - col. 6 line 2. Also, disarm of the security system by the central monitoring station in response to proper authentication in col. 14 lines 3-7 corresponds to enable signal or at least suggests this since the vehicle would not then be disabled as provided when not authorized in col. 14 lines 8-14. Further the transmitted information includes location information in col. 12 lines 51-55 and the remote policy includes location in col. 11 lines 55-65.

Rick discloses an apparatus with a remote master station sending an enable signal if location meets a remote policy (transgression of use not determined) in col. 4 lines 1-47 as an alternative or addition to local comparison. The communication to the master station is triggered by a condition such as drive distance that is a local location policy or at least suggests such.

Hertel discloses an apparatus comprising: a functional unit (40); a location determination device (14); a local policy enforcement device (30, 16) coupled to the location

Art Unit: 2612

determination device and the functional unit; and a communication interface coupled (36) to the local policy enforcement device. See fig. 1 and col. 3 lines 30 - col. 4 line 50. Hertel includes a transmitter 36 to send information related to "failure-to-match" such location (surface coordinates) to a external storage in col. 4 lines 41-49 or a central agency in col. 5 lines 52-67.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in Johnson an enable signal from the central agency in response to meeting a remote policy as disclosed by Rick to allow override (enable) form the central as an alternative or addition to local monitoring of transgressions. It further would have been obvious for communication to the central to have included location information related to a failure to meet a local policy as disclosed in Hertel as a criteria to notify a central agency of the location and suggested by Johnson disclosing reporting a an alarm to a central agency in response to location/position that is not permitted.

Regarding claim 2, the apparatus of Hertel applied above to claim 1 includes the location determination device 14 comprising a position detection device 14 in the form of GPS receiver 14 in col. 3 lines 33-40.

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claim 3, the apparatus of Hertel applied above to claim 2 includes the position determination device 14 comprising a global positioning system receiver in the form of GPS receiver 14 in col. 3 lines 33-40.

Regarding claim 6, the apparatus of Hertel applied above to claim 1 further comprises a user authenticator coupled to the local policy enforcement device. See col. 5 lines 55-60 and col. 4 line 10.

Regarding claim 7, the apparatus of Hertel applied above to claim 6 includes the user authenticator comprising a password device in col. 5 lines 55-60.

Regarding claim 8, Hertel includes authenticator comprising password input rather than a biometric input device. Johnson discloses biometric input such as voice or camera as alternative to entering a code on a keypad. See col. 6 lines 14-38. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in Hertel the biometric input device of claim 8 as disclosed in Johnson to be a an alternative to password input.

Regarding claim 9, the apparatus of Hertel applied above to claim 6 includes the location determination device comprising a global positioning system receiver discussed above in re claim 3.

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claim 11, the apparatus of Hertel applied above to claim 1 includes the local policy enforcement device comprising means for determining whether the apparatus is within a distance from a location such as a radius in col. 4 line 66 - col. 5 line 1.

Regarding claim 12, the apparatus of Hertel applied above to claim 11 includes the distance is a predetermined distance such as 10 meters in col. 4 lines 66-67.

Regarding claim 13, the apparatus of claim Hertel applied above to 11 includes the location is a predetermined location such as permitted surface coordinates stored in database in col. 4 lines 19-23.

Regarding claim 14, the apparatus of Hertel applied above to claim 11 includes the location is a previously-determined location of the apparatus such as the stored coordinates or radius discussed above.

Regarding claim 15, the apparatus of Hertel applied above to claim 14 includes the distance is a predetermined distance as applied above to claim 12.

Regarding claim 16, the apparatus of Hertel applied above to claim 1 includes the local policy enforcement device comprising means for dynamically adapting a local policy in response to previous location determinations and previous

Art Unit: 2612

applications of the local policy in the learning mode of col. 3 lines 63-65.

Regarding claim 17, the apparatus of Hertel applied above to 1 includes the local policy enforcement device comprising means for determining, in response to a determination by the location determination device that the apparatus has been moved to a new location, whether the new location complies with a local policy comparison of current coordinates to permitted coordinates in col. 4 lines 19-23.

Regarding claim 18, the apparatus of Hertel applied above to 17 includes the local policy is whether the new location is a pre-approved location such as permitted surface coordinates stored in database as noted above.

Regarding claim 19, the apparatus of Hertel applied above to claim 17 includes the local policy is whether the new location is within a distance from a prior location of the apparatus such as the radius discussed above.

Regarding claim 20, the apparatus of Hertel applied above to claim 19 includes the distance is a predetermined distance as applied above to claim 12.

Regarding claim 31, Johnson discloses a method of operating an apparatus including performing authentication of an attempted user of the apparatus: if the user is determined to be not

Art Unit: 2612

authorized to use the apparatus, disabling the apparatus; and if the user is determined to be authorized to use the apparatus, determining a location of the apparatus, checking whether the location complies with a local policy administered by the apparatus, if the location complies with the local policy, enabling the apparatus, and if the location does not comply with the local policy, informing an external agent having a remote policy of the location and if the a apparatus complies with the remote policy enabling the apparatus, if the location does not comply with the remote policy, disabling the apparatus. As in claim 1, a failure to meet a local location policy is not expressly disclosed in Johnson and an enable signal from the central agency when the location information complies with a remote policy is not expressly disclosed in Johnson. The differences would have been obvious in view of Rick and Hertel for the same reasons applied above to claim 1 and further in view of col. 11 lines 59-65 of Johnson including remote position information at in database 607 of the central monitoring station. Hertel discloses disabling the system in response to password authorization in col. 5 lines 55-56, and if this does not clearly dis/enable the apparatus, then such would have been obvious in view of Johnson disclosing authorization to prevent

Art Unit: 2612

carjacking or theft as discussed above and Rick requiring a key input in step 304.

Regarding claim 32, the method of claim 31 further comprising: the remote agent providing an electronic notification to a law enforcement device; and the remote agent providing an electronic notification to the law enforcement device; wherein the notifications to the law enforcement device include providing data identifying the location of the apparatus would have been obvious in view of fig. 7 step 725 and col. 14 lines 8-14 of Johnson calling law enforcement officials to inform them about the crime in progress and the location of the vehicle to prevent carjacking and is suggested by transmitting location to police in col. 5 lines 65-67 of Hertel.

Regarding claim 33, the method of claim 32 wherein the notifications to the law enforcement device further include providing data gathered during the authentication of the user would have been obvious in view of informing law enforcement about the crime in progress in fig. 7 step 725 and col. 14 lines 8-14 of Johnson to prevent carjacking.

Regarding claim 34, the method of claim 33 wherein the data comprises biometric input data would have been obvious for the same reason applied above to claim 8.

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claim 35, the method of claim 31 further comprising: the remote agent registering the location of the apparatus would have been obvious in view of the positioning in col. col. 12 lines 51-54 of Johnson to track the vehicle.

Regarding claim 36, the method of claim 31 wherein the local policy comprises determining whether the location is in compliance with a policy selected from the group comprising: the location of the apparatus is within a predetermined area; the location of the apparatus is less than a predetermined distance from a prior location; and the location of the apparatus is a pre-approved location is disclosed by Hertel for the reasons applied above to claims 11-20.

Regarding claim 37, the method of claim 31 wherein the local policy comprises determining whether the location is in compliance with a distance-based policy is disclosed by Hertel for the reasons applied above to claim 11.

Regarding claim 38. the method of claim 31 wherein the local policy comprises determining whether the location is in compliance with an area-based policy is disclosed by Hertel for the reasons applied above to claim 11-20.

Regarding claim 39, the method of claim 31 wherein the remote policy comprises determining whether the location is in compliance with a policy selected from the group comprising: the

Art Unit: 2612

location of the apparatus is within a predetermined area; the location of the apparatus is less than a predetermined distance from a prior location; the location has been pre-approved by a registered owner of the apparatus; the location is an authorized repair facility for the apparatus; all locations have been pre-approved until a first registration at a first location; total motion of the apparatus since a predetermined time is less than a predetermined cumulative distance; the apparatus has been moved fewer times than a predetermined number; and the apparatus is within a non-export-controlled country would have been obvious in view of the policy of Hertel as applied above and the policy of Johnson including, for example, special instructions regarding leaving airport parking lot in col. 11 lines 59-65.

Regarding claim 40, the method of claim 31 further comprising at least one of: dynamically adjusting the local policy; and dynamically adjusting the remote policy is disclosed by Hertel for the same reasons applied to claim 16.

Regarding claim 41, Johnson discloses a system comprising: a communication link an appliance including, a functional unit ; means for dis/enabling the functional unit; a location determination device; a local policy enforcement device coupled to the communication link to the means for dis/enabling, and to

Art Unit: 2612

the location determination device; the local policy device transmitting location information to a remote agent; the remote agent device (central monitoring station) including, a registry adapted to store information regarding the apparatus; and remote policy enforcement device coupled to the communication link and registry to enable/disable the apparatus based on a remote policy. But as in claims 1 and 31, a failure to meet a local location policy in the local policy device is not expressly disclosed in Johnson and an enable signal from the remote policy enforcement device of the central agency when the location information complies with a remote policy is not expressly disclosed in Johnson. The differences would have been obvious in view of Rick and Hertel for the same reasons applied above to claims 1 and 31.

Regarding claim 42, the system of claim 41 wherein the information includes location information would have been obvious for the reasons applied above to claim 35.

Regarding claim 43, the system of claim 42 wherein the appliance further includes a user authentication device coupled to the local policy enforcement device would have been obvious to the reasons applied above to claims 6 and 31.

Regarding claim 44, the system of claim 43 wherein the information further includes user identification information

Art Unit: 2612

would have been obvious in view of the identifying information in col. 11 lines 38-65 of Johnson for preventing carjacking.

Regarding claim 45, the system of claim 41 wherein the location determination device comprises a global positioning system receiver would have been obvious for the same reasons applied above to claim 9. Also, Johnson includes a GPS receiver 419/219.

Regarding claim 47, the system of claim 41 wherein the local policy enforcement device comprises means for determining whether the appliance is in a location, determined by the location determination device, which location complies with a policy selected from the group comprising: the location of the appliance is within a predetermined area; the location of the appliance is less than a predetermined distance from a prior location; and the location of the appliance is a pre-approved location would have been obvious for the reasons applied above to claims 27-29.

Regarding claim 48, the system of claim 47 wherein the remote policy enforcement device comprises means for determining whether the location complies with a policy selected from the group comprising: the location of the appliance is within a predetermined area; the location of the appliance is less than a predetermined distance from a prior location; the location

Art Unit: 2612

has been pre-approved by a registered owner of the appliance; the location is an authorized repair facility for the appliance; all locations have been pre-approved until a first registration at a first location; total motion of the appliance since a predetermined time is less than a predetermined cumulative distance; the appliance has been moved fewer times than a predetermined number; and the appliance is within a permitted country would have been obvious for the reasons applied above to claim 39.

Regarding claim 49, the system of claim 41 further comprising: means for dynamically adjusting a local policy of the local policy enforcement device would have been obvious for the reasons applied above to claim 40.

Regarding claim 50, the system of claim 41 further comprising: means for dynamically adjusting a remote policy of the remote policy enforcement device would have been obvious because the special instructions in col. 11 lines 59-65 of Johnson implies owner or user input which is dynamic. Further, it would have been obvious to have input this in a leaning mode as a convenient manner of data entry disclosed in col. 3 lines 59-67 Hertel as an alternative to keyboard entry.

Regarding claim 51, a method comprising: an apparatus determining its location; the apparatus determining whether the

Art Unit: 2612

location complies with a local policy; the location complies with the local policy, enabling the apparatus; if the location does not comply with the local policy, a remote device determining whether the location complies with a remote policy; if the location complies with the remote policy, enabling the apparatus, if the location does not comply with the remote policy, performing authentication of a user of the apparatus and if the user is authenticated enabling the apparatus would have been obvious for the same reasons applied above to claim 31 and in view of the authentication in col. 6 of Johnson. Violation of the special instruction "should not leave airport parking lot" suggests an alarm condition that requires authorization.

Regarding claim 53, the method of claim 51 further comprising, if the location complies with the remote policy: the remote device registering information provided from the apparatus to the remote device would have been obvious for the reasons applied above to claim 35.

Regarding claim 54, the method of claim 53 wherein the information comprises information identifying the location. would have been obvious for the reasons applied above to claim 35.

Regarding claim 55, the method of claim 51 further comprising, if the user is not authenticated: the remote device

Art Unit: 2612

sending a notification to a law enforcement device would have been obvious for the reasons applied above to claim 32.

Regarding claim 56, the method of claim 55 wherein the notification comprises an identification of the location of the apparatus would have been obvious for the reasons applied above to claim 32.

Regarding claim 57, the method of claim 56 wherein the notification further comprises information gathered during the authentication of the user would have been obvious for the reasons applied above to claim 33.

Regarding claim 58, the method of claim 57 wherein the information comprises biometric input data would have been obvious for the reasons applied above to claim 34.

Regarding claim 59, the method of claim 51 further comprising: the apparatus dynamically adjusting the local policy would have been obvious for the reasons applied above to claim 49

Regarding claim 60, the method of claim 59 further comprising: the remote device dynamically adjusting the remote policy would have been obvious for the reasons applied above to claim 50.

Regarding claim 61, claim 61 generally corresponds to claim 1 with the addition of a disabling means that would have been

Art Unit: 2612

obvious for the same reasons applied above to claim 1 because the applied art includes enabling and disabling.

Regarding claim 62, authentication would have been obvious for the same reasons applied above to claim 6 and 31.

Regarding claim 64, in the apparatus of claim 63, the improvement further comprising: means for authenticating a user of the apparatus; and the means for checking further for causing the means for disabling to enable the functional unit if the user is authentic, and for causing the means for disabling to disable the functional unit if the user is not authentic would have been obvious for the reasons applied above to claim 62.

Regarding claim 65, Johnson discloses a method of operating an apparatus, the method comprising: determining a location of the apparatus; checking a local policy and if not compliant informing a central agency of location. Johnson includes enable/disable signals from a remote agent, but does not expressly disclose enable/disable based on remote location policy. The differences would have been obvious in view of Rick and Hertel for the reasons applied above to claim 1. The further features of claims 66-73 would have been obvious for the same reasons applied to claims above.

Art Unit: 2612

4. Claim 4-5, 10 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson (US 5557254), Rick (US 6552648) and Hertel (US 5532690) and as applied above in combination with Mansell (US 5223844).

The combination applied above lacks the position determination device comprising an accelerometer of claim 4, 10 and 46. Hertel lacks the location detection device comprising a motion detection device of claim 5.

Mansell discloses an analogous art vehicle tracking and security system with position determining that comprises an accelerometer 393 in col. 0 line 54 - col. 10 line 18 with advantages such as economical, miniaturized, greater overall location and direction information. A motion sensor 372 is included in col. 11 lines 15-22 to detect possible theft. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in the combination applied above a position determination device comprising an accelerometer of claims 4 and 10 as disclosed in Mansell for the advantages stated above. It further would have been obvious to have included the location detection device comprising a motion detection device as disclosed in Mansell to detect possible theft.

Art Unit: 2612

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20, 31-51, 53-62, and 64-73 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact an Electronic Business Center (EBC) representatives at 703-305-3028 or toll free at 866-217-9197 between the hours of 6 a.m. and midnight Monday through Friday EST, or by e-mail at ebc@uspto.gov. The Patent EBC is a complete customer service center that supports all Patent e-business products and service applications. Additional information is available on the Patent EBC Web site at <http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html>.

Any inquiry of a general nature should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 receptionist at (571) 272-2600.

Facsimile submissions may be sent via central fax number 571-273-8300 to customer service for entry by technical support staff. Questions related to the operation of the facsimile system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center at (866) 217-9197. On July 15, 2005, the Central FAX Number will change to.


CENTRALIZED DELIVERY POLICY: For patent related correspondence, hand carry deliveries must be made to the Customer Service Window (now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), and facsimile transmissions must be sent to the Central FAX number, unless an exception applies. For example, if the examiner has rejected claims in a regular U.S. patent application, and the reply to the examiner's Office action is desired to be transmitted by facsimile rather than mailed, the reply must be sent to the Central FAX Number. Inquiries concerning only hours and

Art Unit: 2612

location of the Customer Window may be directed to OIPE Customer Service at (703) 308-1202.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edwin C. Holloway, III whose telephone number is (571) 272-3058. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:00). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber can be reached on (571) 272-7308.

EH
6/5/06


EDWIN C. HOLLOWAY, III
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2612